

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION OFFICE

Economic Development Division
Planning, Neighborhoods & Economic Development Department

Community Development Block Grant Program
Applications
REVIEW PANEL HANDBOOK

A Guide for the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board
FY 2015 Applications Review Process
Contact: CDBG@sandiego.gov

City of San Diego - HUD Programs Administration Office

The City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office oversees federally funded entitlement grant programs including the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program.

The Community Development Block Grant Program

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provides funds to local jurisdictions on an annual basis through the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) for local community development, housing activities, and public services. The primary objective of the CDBG Program is the development of viable communities through the provision of decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities. In accordance with CDBG standards, these resources are intended to primarily benefit low- and moderate-income persons and neighborhoods.

City of San Diego - Consolidated Plan Advisory Board

The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) was established by the City Council via Ordinance No. O-19963 (Sections 26.2101–26.2113 of the Municipal Code) to provide advice and recommendations on certain policy issues related to the City of San Diego HUD grant entitlements inclusive of the CDBG program. Specifically, per §26.2113, the CPAB is charged with performing an open and impartial evaluation of the applications for CDBG funds and provide funding recommendations to the City Council.

Purpose

This *CPAB Panel Handbook* outlines the process and procedures to be followed by the members of the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) in scoring the applications submitted to the City of San Diego for CDBG funding available for projects and programs commencing on July 1, 2014.

For more information please contact the City of San Diego HUD Programs Office at:

City of San Diego – HUD Programs
Economic Development
1200 Third Avenue
Suite 1400, MS 56D
San Diego, CA 92101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	4
II.	Review Panel: Responsibilities and Conduct	4
III.	City Staff: Responsibilities	5
IV.	Schedule.....	6
V.	Conflict of Interest Guidelines	7
VI.	Confidentiality.....	9
VII.	Review Package	10
VIII.	Reviewing & Scoring Applications	12
	1. Preparation: Prior and During the Review.....	12
	2. Reading and Analyzing Applications.....	13
	3. Ad Hoc Committee Meetings	14
	4. CPAB February Meeting: Public Input.....	15
	5. Scoring Applications	16
	6. Finalized Scores	16
IX.	Reviewers Oral and Written Comments	17
X.	CPAB Ratification of Scores	18
XI.	Next steps	19
	APPENDIX A: Confidentiality Agreement – CPAB Members.....	20
	APPENDIX B: List of Applicant Agencies and Projects - CDBG FY 2015	22
	APPENDIX C: Conflict of Interest Statement	26

I. INTRODUCTION

The *City of San Diego CDBG Panel Handbook* (Handbook) outlines the process the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) will follow in reviewing applications submitted for the FY 2015 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding cycle. The Handbook identifies the roles and responsibilities of the CPAB (*reviewers or review panel*) as well as the procedures they will follow in conducting their review.

The Handbook also provides guidance in regard to the required forms and discusses conflict-of-interest guidelines panel members must take into consideration. Finally, the Handbook identifies the roles and responsibilities of City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office staff (*City staff*) and outlines the procedures City staff will follow in order to support the review panel in carrying out its obligation and to ensure a fair and transparent process.

The review of CDBG applications is a vital step in the CDBG funds allocation process. The process is intended to yield an objective evaluation of grant applications through a competitive process which results in funding and subsequently delivering the best projects and programs to City residents.

Reviewers are required to: (1) report any possible conflict of interest; (2) consider only specified evaluation criteria in scoring the applications; (3) maintain confidentiality before, during, and after the review period; and, (4) return all applications and review forms to the City staff at the close of the review. The City of San Diego has developed this handbook to outline the review process and identify the duties and responsibilities of the review panel members.

II. REVIEW PANEL: RESPONSIBILITIES AND CONDUCT

The review panel members, charged with the responsibility of conducting an independent and objective review of the CDBG applications in accordance with all applicable standards, must be able to fulfill the following responsibilities:

1. Read and become familiar with supplementary materials provided (inclusive of this Handbook) prior to the commencement of their review;
2. Attend and participate fully in the Ad Hoc Committee meetings;
3. Recuse themselves from the review of applications where an actual or apparent conflict of interest may be present;
4. Consider, review and score each application in relation to the review and scoring criteria approved by the City Council;

5. Refer all applicant contact to the HUD Programs Office staff;
6. Abide by the review schedule (shown below); and,
7. Complete their review on or before the March 3, 2014 deadline and return all materials to the HUD Programs Administration Office upon completion of the review.

Reviewers must be able to dedicate a significant amount of time to this process within a very limited timeframe. If they find they are unable to fulfill their obligations, they are asked to contact City staff immediately.

III. CITY STAFF: RESPONSIBILITIES

City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office staff (*City staff*), charged with the responsibility of ensuring the CDBG allocation process is impartial and consistent with all applicable standards, are charged with:

1. Preparing a summary of prior CDBG funding history of the applicant agencies and a CDBG Programmatic and Fiscal Summary of the proposed projects as described in the application;
2. Delivering all needed materials to reviewers in a timely manner and retrieving the required materials from the reviewers at a place that is convenient to them;
3. Responding to all inquiries from the reviewers promptly in a clear and accurate manner;
4. Consulting with staff from HUD and the City Attorneys' Office and other professionals as may be warranted during the process in order to ensure said process is consistent with all applicable policies and regulations;
5. Sharing with **all** reviewers any information that may have been passed on to one reviewer in response to his/her inquiry if said information is considered significant to the review process;
6. Facilitating the Ad Hoc meetings, scheduling said meetings working within the time constraints of the participants and providing the space where the meetings take place;
7. Organizing the February CPAB meeting and exercising as much care as

possible to ensure the meeting proceeds in an efficient and organized manner;

8. Computing the average score assigned to each application based on the individual scores assigned to that application by all the participating reviewers;
9. Arriving at a ranking of the applications (based on their average scores –on descending order) and presenting these average scores and resulting ranking to the CPAB for their ratification during their March meeting;
10. Presenting said ranking to the City Council along with CPAB members as the order in which CPAB recommends projects are funded (based on available funds);
11. Incorporating the City Council decision for funding in the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan; and,
12. Submitting the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan on or before the federal deadline to HUD.

Finally, City staff is committed to providing opportunities throughout the process to gather input and comments from the public at large, applicant agencies, CPAB members and all other interested parties. The purpose of this is twofold: (1) to ensure a fully participatory process; and, (2) to gather input that can be incorporated into the evaluation of the process in order to make improvements in the future.

IV. SCHEDULE

Task	Date
Transmittal of the CDBG Applications Review Panel Handbook to CPAB	1/31/2014
Hand delivery of Review Binder & Review Reference Binder (as described below) to CPAB	02/05/2014
CPAB February Meeting: Applicants & related input during public meeting	02/12/2014

Task	Date
Ad Hoc meetings	02/12/2014 – 03/07/2014
Completed/signed Scoring Forms due to City	03/03/2014
CPAB March Meeting: Ratification of Scores/Ranking	03/12/2014
Presentation of CPAB recommendation for funding to City Council	Tentative: 03/24/14 or 03/25/2014
Draft FY 2015 Action Plan presented to CPAB	Late March – Early April
Draft FY 2015 Action Plan released for 30-day public review period	
Presentation of FY 2015 Action Plan to Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods City Council Committee (PN&LN) & subsequently to City Council	Mid to Late April
Submittal of FY 2015 Action Plan to HUD	No later than 05/15/2014

V. CONFLICT OF INTEREST GUIDELINES

To ensure compliance with HUD requirements as well as all other applicable standards and ensure a fair and open environment for access to opportunities that arise from HUD-assisted programs, the City of San Diego must adhere to several conflict of interest measures. A conflict of interest generally describes a situation in which financial or other personal considerations have the **potential** to compromise or bias professional judgment and objectivity.

The CDBG conflict of interest provisions at the federal level are based on the regulations found at 24 CFR 570.611(b) which read in substance as follows:

No person who is an employee, agent, consultant, officer, or elected or appointed official of the recipient (City of San Diego in this instance), or any designated public agencies, or any sub-recipient which is receiving CDBG funds and who exercises or has exercised any functions or responsibilities with respect

to CDBG activities or who is in a position to participate in a decision-making process or gain inside information with regard to such activities, may obtain a personal or financial interest or benefit from the activity, or have an interest in any contract, subcontract or agreement with respect thereto, or in any of its proceeds, either for themselves **or those with whom they have family or business ties**, during their tenure and for one year thereafter.

In accordance with federal standards, the CDBG applications' review process is also subject to the United States Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as set forth in Circular A-102, Uniform Requirements for Assistance to State and Local Governments. Said standards prohibit City employees as well as its officers and agents from participating in the selection or in the award or administration of a contract supported by Federal funds if a conflict of interest, real or apparent, is involved. Note that even **apparent** conflicts of interest are prohibited.

The City of San Diego Municipal Code also governs the actions of the CPAB in relation to conflicts of interests and requires CPAB members to recuse themselves from participating "in any decision in which she or he has any personal or financial interest" (see § 26.2109).

The City Council has also adopted Policy No. 000-4, which is the code of Ethics for all city employees and board and commission members.

Within the context of the conflict of interest guidelines, *financial interest* (generally considered "actual" conflicts rather than "apparent" ones) include:

- Receipt of gifts of \$360 or more in value in the previous twelve months from an applicant organization;
- Receipt or promise of income (e.g., salary) from an applicant organization in the previous 12 months;
- Having an investment of \$1,000 or more in an applicant organization;
- Holding a position of management or serving on the board of an applicant organization, whether in a paid or unpaid position, **within the previous twelve months**; and,
- Ownership of real estate with a value of \$1,000 or more with an applicant organization.

As noted, federal standards also prohibit apparent conflicts of interests. An **apparent conflict of interest** is generally considered to occur when the circumstances are such

that a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts would question the impartiality of the reviewer in his/her evaluation of an application.

Review panel members are obligated to report any such conflicts of interest to City staff immediately. Reviewers can declare the presence of such conflicts via email or via a phone call. Declaring such conflicts does not mean that reviewers cannot serve; it simply means reviewers may not review or participate in the Ad Hoc meetings' discussions of those applications with which the conflict exists. It is important to note that a conflict of interest exists whether or not decisions are affected by a personal interest –conflicts of interest only imply the potential for bias is present.

Reviewers must keep in mind the conflict of interest provisions during the process as potential conflicts may exist in relation to the applicant agency, its board members, its staff, the proposed project itself, its intended beneficiaries and/or other parties that may be affected by the project.

If at any point during the process, a reviewer determines the potential presence of an actual or apparent conflict of interest, that reviewer must declare the presence of such conflict to City staff and recuse herself/himself from reviewing the pertinent application and participating in related discussions. When in doubt, a reviewer is expected to contact City staff for guidance.

This responsibility is strictly imposed upon reviewers and reviewers are required to complete the Conflict of Interest Statement and submit it to City staff prior to the receipt of the review binder. If the reviewer identifies the presence of a conflict of interest at any point during the review process, the reviewer is also obligated to report such conflict immediately to City staff.

VI. CONFIDENTIALITY

Applications and supporting materials are passed on to the review panel members in strict confidence and reviewers must respect that confidentiality. The materials in the *review binders* (as described below) may not be photocopied or reproduced in any manner and must be returned to the City along with the completed scoring forms upon completion of the reviews. Reviewers are also expected to safeguard these documents once they have received them and use the information strictly for its intended use.

Furthermore, reviewers may only discuss the applications, their contents, and their own assessments of the applications or similar related matters during the Ad Hoc meetings and/or with City staff as part of related inquiries.

Completion of a Confidentiality Agreement is required of all reviewers prior to their receipt of the *review binder* (as described below). Reviewers must abide by the provisions of said agreement.

VII. REVIEW PACKAGE

Each Board member participating in the review of the CDBG applications for FY 2015 receives the *review binders* on February 5. The *review binders* contain the following documents:

- Applications: This material includes the portion of the applications which is subject to the review of the CPAB as part of their scoring, the letters of support submitted as well as the roster of the Board of the applicant agency/organization.
- CDBG Programmatic and Fiscal Project Summary: This document is prepared by City staff and outlines the main characteristics of the proposed project as described in the application.
- Project Funding History: This document is also prepared by City staff and summarizes prior City of San Diego CDBG funding allocated to the same applicant agency during fiscal years 2012 – 2014.

The information in the binders is provided to the CPAB strictly in hard copy form –no digital copies are distributed to the reviewers and reviewers are asked to not reproduce these materials in any form.

In addition to the *review binders*, reviewers also receive the following supplemental materials (CPAB Review Reference Binder):

- List of Applicants & Projects: This table provides a listing of all of the applications submitted sorting them on a per-project category (CIP, CED and PS). The information provided includes the name of the applicant agency and the name of the proposed project as identified by the applicant in the application. The List of Applicants & Projects is attached as Appendix B.
- Review & Scoring Criteria: The Review & Scoring Criteria (*Review Criteria*) was presented to the Public Safety and Livable Neighborhoods City Council Committee (PN&LN) on October 30th, 2013. PN&LN unanimously accepted the review and scoring criteria as presented by staff and directed staff to forward the item to the full Council as a consent item. The item was approved on consent by the City Council on January 14, 2014.

The Review Criteria assigns a specific number of points to each of six categories as shown below (further details regarding what each of these entail is provided in the subject document):

	Review Criteria Category	Maximum Points
1	Relationship with the FY 2015 – FY 2019 Consolidated Plan Goals	10
2	Benefits to low income residents	20
3	Project outcomes	20
4	Activity & timelines	20
5	Organizational capacity of applicant agency	15
6	Project budget and non-CDBG leverage funds	15
Total		100

- CDBG Scoring Matrix: The Scoring Matrix refers to a tool that has been developed to create further definition and structure for scoring applications. The Scoring Matrix provides guidance within the point range allowed in each category.
- Scoring Form: Scoring Forms are used by the reviewers in order to record the points awarded to each application reviewed and provide comments in writing regarding the applications. Said comments are optional. These forms are submitted by the reviewers to the HUD Programs Office upon completion of the reviews. The Scoring Forms are made available to the applicant agencies upon completion of the FY 2015 CDBG allocation process (submittal of the Action Plan to HUD). Prior to their distribution to an applicant agency in response to their request, names and signatures of the reviewers are redacted from the forms.
- Council Policy 700-02: This City Council Policy establishes the general guidelines by which the City selects and implements activities utilizing Community Development Block Grant funds.
- FY 2015- FY 2019 Consolidated Plan Goals: The City Council approved the Consolidated Plan Goals for the FY 2015 – FY 2019 period on December 16, 2013 via Resolution No. 2014-363. The goals apply to the CDBG program and are

considered as part of the CPAB review of the applications (see Review Criteria Category table above).

- **Conflict of Interest Statement:** By signing this form, reviewers acknowledge they have read and understood the conflict of interest provisions that apply to the CDBG applications' review process and agree to fully comply with said provisions. Reviewers also identify any applications that they must recuse from reviewing in accordance with the conflict of interest standards. The Conflict of Interest Statement is attached as Appendix C.
- **Confidentiality Agreement:** By signing this form, reviewers agree to comply with a number of provisions which safeguard confidentiality provisions. The Confidentiality Agreement is attached as Appendix A.

VIII. REVIEWING & SCORING APPLICATIONS

The following sections provide details regarding the six primary elements of the review process for the CPAB members:

1. Preparation
2. Reading and Analyzing Applications
3. Discussion at Ad Hoc Committee Meetings
4. CPAB February Meeting: Applicants Input
5. Scoring Applications
6. Close Up

NOTE 1: Reviewers are encouraged to call on City staff for technical assistance and/or clarifications through the process as they deem necessary. City staff will be readily available to the reviewers during the process via email or phone.

NOTE 2: Reviewers are expected to limit their evaluation to information contained in the *review binders* using the *CPAB Review Reference Binder*. Outside knowledge or hearsay is not considered as there is no certainty regarding its accuracy and the City wants to ensure that applicants are not penalized nor rewarded them based on unsubstantiated information.

NOTE 3: Reviewers are asked to refrain from interaction with the applicant agencies and/or intended beneficiaries and/or supporters of any of the proposed projects or applicant agencies.

1. PREPARATION: PRIOR AND DURING THE REVIEW

Prior to the receipt of the *review package* as described above, reviewers are required to:

1. Examine the **List of Applicants and Projects** (Appendix B) and identify any proposal and/or applicant agency **where** a conflict of interest **may exist**; and,
2. Complete the **Conflict of Interest Statement** (Appendix C) and return it to City staff signed and dated.
3. Read the **Confidentiality Agreement** (see Appendix B) and return this form to City staff signed and dated;

Any applications where a conflict is noted will be removed from the *review package* of appropriate reviewer(s).

In regards to conflict of interest matters, reviewers are reminded that a potential conflict of interest may not be identified until applications are read and examined in detail because reviewers have very limited information until receipt of the *review package*. Said package includes critical information which the review panel members **had** not been privy to until receipt of the *review package* such as a roster of board members of the applicant agency, a listing of certain staff employed by the applicant agency, and details about projects as proposed.

Reviewers must keep conflict of interest matters in mind **throughout** process and report the presence of such conflicts to City staff as soon as these are recognized. Once reviewers receive the review package, they must study the Board composition of the applicant agencies (included in binder) in order to identify any potential conflicts of interest and report those to City staff. Further, as reviewers proceed with their individual review of applications, they must keep in the mind the conflict of interest guidelines in order to identify other potential conflicts of interests that may not have been identified until then.

Again, any and all potential conflicts of interest must be reported to City staff and reviewers are required to recuse themselves from reviewing/scoring those applications and refrain from further reading any of the related documents. City staff will promptly retrieve those documents from the appropriate reviewer(s) throughout the process.

2. READING AND ANALYZING APPLICATIONS

Reviewers are instructed to evaluate applications on the basis of the criteria approved by the City Council. Reviewers begin by reading the materials critically with the primary purpose of determining how closely the proposed project conforms to the criteria. Reviewers are expected to fully familiarize themselves with said criteria prior to the reading of the applications.

The review criteria are divided into six major categories and each category is composed of several elements that must be considered in order to determine how well the application responds to each criterion. When reading applications, reviewers' attention

should be focused on locating the information that relates to these criteria.

As reviewers identify the most pertinent information in relation to the evaluation criteria, reviewers make a determination regarding the quality of said information. This analysis requires reviewers to conduct an objective appraisal of the information provided by the applicant in order to discern how well it responds to the criteria. As part of this analysis, the reviewer considers the proposed project elements and asks himself/herself questions such as the following:

1. Does the information fully respond to all applicable elements of the respective criterion?
2. Is the information clear and specific (rather than vague and/or open to numerous interpretations)?
3. Do concepts, ideas and/or procedures flow in a logical manner?
4. Is the proposed outcome measurable? Is it consistent with the project objective(s)?
5. Are the proposed activities and outcomes appropriate in relation to the project objectives?
6. Has the applicant allocated non-CDBG resources to the project as proposed?
7. Is the information presented reasonable and consistent with accepted knowledge and practices?
8. Is the information in any one section consistent with other sections of the application?

Given **each** reviewer must read and score **each** application within a limited timeframe, reviewers are encouraged to consider the number of applications that must be reviewed and allot an appropriate amount of time for each once they have familiarized themselves with the process. Establishing a maximum time for applications reviewed early in the sequence will ensure subsequent applications receive sufficient attention.

Reviewers must keep in mind their obligation to consider individual applications in relation to the evaluation criteria. Applications are not compared to one another as every proposal and its merits and weaknesses stand on their own.

3. AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Prior to scoring any one application at the individual level, the reviewers meet at the Ad Hoc Committee level in order to discuss applications with one another and exchange considerations. Two Ad Hoc Committees have been established for this purpose. Neither committee has more than four CPAB members and hence no CPAB quorum is achieved at the Ad Hoc committee level. Only CPAB committee members and City staff participate in these meeting.

Each of the two Ad Hoc Committees considers and discusses **all** of the applications but no interactions take place across the committees. Reviewers are also expected to complete their evaluations and score forms independently and do not collaborate with one another during the process.

It is important to note that Ad Hoc Committee meetings are **not** intended to allow members to reach consensus but rather to hear from one another. Such interactions are aimed at expanding the point of view of the individual reviewers and encourage them to consider in their review factors they may have initially overlooked.

Given the volume of applications that must be considered, a predetermined set of applications are discussed during the first Ad Hoc meeting and the remainder of the applications are discussed during the second meeting. This process is repeated for each of the two Ad Hoc committees.

Before attending the initial Ad Hoc meeting, each reviewer should have already thoroughly read the set of applications that will be discussed at that meeting and written preliminary notes as warranted.

The Ad Hoc Committee meetings are facilitated by City staff and take place at City offices. City staff does **not** participate in the evaluation of the applications in relation to the set criteria nor does staff participate in the scoring. Staff also provides technical assistance during the Ad Hoc meetings by responding to any questions the reviewers may have, correcting technical inaccuracies that may arise and reminding the reviewers of their responsibilities as warranted.

4. CPAB FEBRUARY MEETING: PUBLIC INPUT

The CPAB meeting scheduled for February 12th (scheduled a week after reviewers receive the review package) provides the opportunity to all applicant agencies (and/or their supporters, clients or such) to speak about their agencies and/or proposed projects and/or related matters. The meeting is fully devoted to this purpose and it takes place during the time allocated to the CPAB to conduct the review, one week after they have received the *review binders* but approximately three weeks before they have to submit the results of their review to City staff.

Given the volume of applications received, the time allocated to public comments during this CPAB meeting is limited. Applicant agencies (or those speaking on their behalf) must limit their comments to two minutes **collectively**. Agencies which submitted more than one proposal will be allocated three minutes (regardless of the total number of proposals submitted). Note these limits apply on a per-applicant-agency basis rather than on a per-speaker basis. The CPAB members do not comment on individual projects nor are they permitted to ask questions of the speakers. Further, to prevent the appearance of public lobbying, CPAB members are discouraged from interacting with applicants before, during or after these proceedings.

It is important to note that there is **no** requirement for applicant agencies to participate in this meeting. As such, the scores must not penalize non-participating agencies. Scores are based strictly on the strengths and weaknesses of individual applications in relation to the review criteria approved by the City Council.

5. SCORING APPLICATIONS

Reviewers must identify the most significant strengths and weaknesses of the application at hand and consider their relative gravity when assigning scores. Once a reviewer has reached a conclusion regarding the appropriate scores for each of the six sections of the application that are assigned individual scores, scores are recorded in the *scoring form* after the reviewer writes down the name of the applicant and project under consideration in said form. Reviewers must use **whole** numbers in assigning scores to the individual sections.

After the sections-specific scores are recorded, the reviewer totals these in order to arrive at his/her overall score for that application. Reviewers should also double check scores in order to ensure they have been correctly entered and the sum result is correct. Reviewers are encouraged to provide their comments in the scoring form as these will be made available to the applicant agencies upon their request as a means to provide feedback.

The scoring form is not complete until the reviewer has recorded his/her name on it as well as signed and dated it. The forms will be made available to the applicants (upon their request) following the ratification of the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan by the City Council. The Annual Action plan, in part, constitutes the City of San Diego application for the FY 2015 CDBG funds to HUD. The names and signatures of the individual reviewers are redacted from the scoring forms prior to their distribution to the applicant agencies.

6. FINALIZED SCORES

Upon completion of the review and scoring process (on or before March 3, 2014), the review panel members submit to City staff the original scoring forms (wet signatures

required) and return the *review binders*. All materials can be picked up at a place that is convenient to the reviewers by City staff or special courier. Reviewers have not completed the review process until these materials are received by City staff and/or their representatives.

IX. REVIEWERS ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewers play a critical role in the CDBG funding allocation process. They provide comments orally during the Ad Hoc meetings and they also have the option of recording their comments in writing on scoring forms. Comments concerning the applications provide objective and substantiated information upon which evaluations can be made. Good comments are those that solidly address the quality of the proposal as it relates to the review criteria. The best comments are tactful and well-balanced.

Reviewers **do not**:

- Penalize an applicant because he/she feels the institution doesn't need the money. Reviewers must keep in mind that any eligible organization may apply for and receive CDBG funding, regardless of need.
- Use prior or outside knowledge of an applicant organization. Comments and scores are based only on the information at hand.
- Impose their own standards –reviewers evaluate the applications in relation to the criteria approved by the City Council.
- Make sarcastic or derogatory remarks.
- Question an applicant's honesty or integrity.
- Offer or ask for irrelevant or extraneous information – the comments of the reviewers pertain only to the information required of applicants.

Although each application is unique and deserves its own unique responses, reviewers may find the following sample comments helpful in developing their own.

Sample Comments:

- *Overall, the application does not address the review criteria with sufficient detail.*
- *The application clearly shows this agency has the experience needed to successfully implement the proposed project.*

- *This applicant demonstrates that significant resources have been invested into the proposed project and the project is ready to become a reality in the immediate future.*
- *Objectives/outcomes do not appear to be measurable nor are they clearly stated.*
- *It is not clear how the project as proposed relates to the selected Consolidated Plan goal.*
- *It is not clear how the proposed actions/activities will be implemented.*
- *The outcomes do not appear to be commensurate with the budget.*
- *The information provided demonstrated the quality of the program/project.*

Reviewers must keep in mind that the *scoring forms* are intended to serve as a form of training and technical assistance to applicant agencies. These forms serve as the mechanism the City uses to provide feedback to the applicant agencies regarding the strengths and/or weaknesses of their applications. Therefore, these written comments should be as detailed as possible and provide specific information about the applications in relation to the specific elements considered as part of the criteria.

Comments should clearly state why a particular issue is a weakness so applicants know where they may be room for improvement for future opportunities. Similarly, statements regarding strengths should indicate where specifically these strengths lie. Useful comments are specific to the individual applications and are directed to applicants for their consideration.

Finally, as appropriate, reviewers are asked to cite applications' sections or page numbers in order to provide clear and thoughtful guidance to the applicants.

X. CPAB RATIFICATION OF SCORES

Upon completion of the reviews and submittal of the scoring forms to the City, staff computes the average score assigned to each application based on the individual scores assigned to that application by all the reviewers which participated in said review. The applications are then segregated into the two following groups based on the rules which govern the use of CDBG moneys which limit the amount of funds that may be allocated to public service projects:

1. Capital improvement and community/economic development projects; and,

2. Public service projects.

The applications in each of these two groups are ranked based on their average scores – on descending order. Once compiled, average scores and resulting rankings are then posted on the City's CDBG Program website and notification of their availability is given to all applications and subscribers of the City's email distribution list. Average scores and resulting rankings will subsequently be presented to the CPAB for their ratification during the March CBAB meeting.

XI. Next steps

Following the CPAB March meeting, the two rankings are presented to the City Council as the order in which CPAB recommends projects are funded (based on available funds). Staff then incorporates the City Council decision for funding in the FY 2015 Annual Action Plan and releases the Plan for a 30-day public review. The Action Plan must include a description of how CDBG resources will be allocated among all funding categories and, in fact, constitutes the application to HUD for receipt of the City's 2015 CDBG entitlement. The Annual Action Plan must be submitted to HUD on or before May 15, 2014.

APPENDIX A: Confidentiality Agreement – CPAB MEMBERS
FY 2015 CDBG Funding Review and Scoring Panel

I, _____, have been appointed to serve as member of the Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) and will be evaluating and scoring the proposals submitted in response to the FY 2015 Request for Proposal for Community Block Development Grant (CDBG) funding ("FY 2015 CDBG Applications").

Per the City of San Diego Municipal Code §26.2113, I am charged with performing an open and impartial evaluation of the FY 2015 CDBG Applications and provide funding recommendations to the City Council. Specifically, I will be reviewing the FY 2015 CDBG Applications in relation to a set of criteria approved by the City Council and assigning a score to each Application based on said review.

I hereby acknowledge and/or agree to the following in performing this review:

1. I understand that all information I receive during the review process, including but not limited to the name(s) of specific applicants and/or their proposed project names, the contents of specific proposals, my evaluations and those of other evaluators, discussions regarding proposals during the Ad Hoc Committees meetings, and all related information constitutes "Confidential Information."
2. I understand and I agree to hold all Confidential Information in the strictest confidence.
3. I understand that any unauthorized disclosure of Confidential Information will compromise the fairness of the process and may result in harm to the City of San Diego and/or its constituents.
4. I will use said information strictly for its intended, official and authorized purpose: scoring the FY 2015 CDBG Applications in relation to a set of criteria approved by the City Council.
5. I will safeguard all review materials provided to me by City staff as part of the "Review Binder(s)" and promptly return said materials to City staff upon completion of the evaluation process.

Initials

Date

6. I will not use any of the review information for matters that do not pertain to the City of San Diego CDBG Program and at no point will I use said information for my private gain or the private gain of others, either by my direct or indirect action or by giving counsel, recommendation, or suggestions to others.
7. I will not have any direct or indirect contact or discussions with any party who submits a proposal and/or their representatives.
8. I agree to immediately notify City of San Diego HUD Programs Administration Office staff if I obtain information outside of this review process that could impair or could create the appearance of impairing my ability to evaluate proposals fairly and impartially.

Read and accepted by:

Name

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B: List of Applicant Agencies and Projects - CDBG FY 2015

Public Service Projects	
1.	Alpha Project for the Homeless <i>Homeless Outreach</i>
2.	The Angel's Depot <i>Senior Emergency Meal Box Program</i>
3.	Casa Familiar <i>Casa Familiar Senior Services</i>
4.	Casa Familiar <i>San Ysidro STEM</i>
5.	Catholic Charities, Diocese of San Diego <i>Rachel's Women's Center</i>
6.	Center for Community Solutions <i>You are the Solution: Volunteer Response to Relationship & Sexual Violence</i>
7.	Center for Employment Opportunities <i>Employment Reentry for Parolees and Probationers</i>
8.	The Children's Initiative <i>The San Diego School Success Program</i>
9.	Christie's Place, Inc. <i>Coordinated Services for Women, Children & Families</i>
10.	ElderHelp of San Diego <i>The Concierge Club</i>
11.	Family Health Centers of San Diego <i>Safe Point San Diego</i>
12.	Fourth District Seniors Resource Center <i>Fourth District Seniors Resource Center</i>
13.	Harmonium, Inc. <i>PASO 'A Positive Step Forward'</i>

14.	Interfaith Shelter Network of San Diego <i>Rotational Shelter Program</i>
15.	Juma Ventures <i>Pathways</i>
16.	Mama's Kitchen, Inc. <i>Home-Delivered Meal Service – San Diego</i>
17.	San Diego Housing Commission <i>Senior Resident Service Coordination</i>
18.	San Diego Second Chance Program <i>Second Chance Job Readiness Training Program</i>
19.	San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program, Inc. <i>Safe and Secure Families Project</i>
20.	San Diego Workforce Partnership <i>CONNECT2Careers</i>
21.	San Diego Youth Services <i>Storefront Youth Shelter Project</i>
22.	Say San Diego <i>Trauma Support Services</i>
23.	St. Vincent de Paul Village, Inc. <i>Rapid Rehousing Expansion Project</i>
24.	Survivors of Torture, International <i>Survivors of Torture, International</i>
25.	Thomas Jefferson School of Law <i>Family Justice Center Legal Network</i>
26.	Urban Corps of San Diego County <i>YouthBuild Vocational Instructor</i>
27.	Voices for Children <i>Court Appointed Special Advocate Program</i>

Community & Economic Development	
1.	Access <i>Access Microenterprises Development Project</i>
2.	Accion San Diego <i>Micro-lending</i>
3.	Alliance for African Assistance <i>Entrepreneur Assistance Program</i>
4.	Bayside Community Center <i>Microenterprise Program</i>
5.	City of San Diego, Environmental Services Department <i>Lead Safety Enforcement Project FY 2015</i>
6.	Community HousingWorks <i>Homeownership Program</i>
7.	Horn of Africa <i>San Diego Micro-Enterprise Project</i>
8.	LISC San Diego <i>Greater Logan Micro-Enterprise Program</i>
9.	San Diego Housing Commission <i>Direct Homeownership Assistance</i>
10.	Southwestern Community College <i>Microenterprise Family Childcare Program</i>
11.	Southwestern Community College District <i>Youth Entrepreneurship Program</i>
12.	Union of Pan Asian Communities (UPAC) <i>Multi-Cultural Economic Development Program (UPAC-MED)</i>

Capital Improvement Projects	
1.	Alliance for African Assistance <i>Capital Improvement</i>
2.	The Arc of San Diego <i>North Shores Renovations for People with Disabilities</i>
3.	Boys & Girls Clubs of Greater San Diego <i>Clairemont Boys & Girls Club Education Nutrition Ctr.</i>
4.	Center for Employment Training <i>CET San Diego Training Center Upgrade Project</i>
5.	City Heights Community Development Center <i>Neighborhood Rehabilitation Program</i>
6.	City of San Diego-Environmental Services Depart. <i>Safe & Healthy Homes Project FY 2015</i>

Capital Improvement Projects	
7. City of San Diego-Environmental Services Depart.	<i>Mountain View Neighborhood park ADA Upgrades</i>
8. Civic San Diego	<i>City Heights Pedestrian Improvements</i>
9. Civic San Diego	<i>Park Boulevard at San Diego High School Pedestrian Crossing Improvements</i>
10. Family Health Centers of San Diego	<i>Logan Heights Behavioral Health Center</i>
11. GRID Alternatives	<i>San Diego Solar Affordable Homes Program</i>
12. Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation	<i>Northwest Village Chollas Creek Restoration</i>
13. Jacobs & Cushman San Diego Food Bank	<i>Warehouse Capacity Building</i>
14. Junior Achievement of San Diego County, Inc.	<i>Junior Achievement expansion</i>
15. Ocean Beach Community Development Corporation	<i>Ocean Beach Women's Shelter Renovation</i>
16. Rebuilding Together San Diego	<i>Residential Rehabilitation Program</i>
17. San Diego Center for Children	<i>Vital Campus Security Improvements for San Diego Center for Children</i>
18. San Ysidro Health Center	<i>CHC-Ocean View Pharmacy Renovation Project</i>
19. St. Paul's Senior Homes & Services	<i>McColl health Center HVAC & Roof Replacement</i>
20. S.V.D.P. Management, Inc.	<i>Toussaint Academy San Diego Facility Rehabilitation Project</i>
21. S.V.D.P. Management, Inc.	<i>Villa Harvey Mandel Rehabilitation Project</i>
22. Townspeople	<i>Neighborhood Development One House at a Time</i>
23. Urban Corps of San Diego County	<i>Urban Corps Facility Improvements</i>

APPENDIX C: Conflict of Interest Statement

I have carefully read the conflict of interest provisions as described in the CDBG Program Applications – Review Panel Handbook and hereby certify the following:

1. I acknowledge that real and apparent conflicts of interest may exist;
2. I will be mindful of the conflict of interest provisions **throughout** the review process;
3. I will identify instances where conflict(s) of interest may exist and promptly report those to City of San Diego HUD Program Administration Office staff via email and/or phone call and subsequently recuse myself from participating in the review process of the affected applications;
4. For any instances where I identify conflicts of interests **throughout** the review process, I will facilitate retrieval of the affected documents by City staff within a reasonable timeframe.

Please check the option below that reflects your status:

____ I have reviewed the list of FY 2015 CDBPG applicant agencies and the names of their proposed projects and, based on that review, I have NO conflicts of interest to report at this time.

____ I have reviewed the list of FY 2015 CDBPG applicant agencies and the names of their proposed projects and disclose conflicts of interest with the following applicant agencies and/or projects at this time:

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____